

*Cedar Creek and Belle Grove National Historical Park
Park Advisory Commission Meeting*

November 16, 2006

Strasburg Town Hall
Strasburg, Virginia

Agenda

- I) General Introductions
- II) Review and Approval of Minutes from 21 September 2006 (10 minutes)
- III) Election of Commission Vice-Chair (10 minutes)
- IV) GMP Status Update (10 minutes)
- V) GMP alternative concepts; presentation and group discussion
- VI) Old Business
 - Bylaws
- VII) New Business
 - Park landowners forum to be held 22 January 2007
- VIII) Next Meeting – 18 January 2007 in Middletown

Meeting Notes

Commission members in attendance: Diann Jacox, Designated Federal Official (DFO); Mary Bowser, Chairperson; Elizabeth McClung; Howard Kittell; Gene Dicks; Jim Smalls; Randolph Jones; Fred Andreae; Dan Stickley; Kris Tierney

Commission members absent: Roy Downey; Gary Rinkerman; Richard Kleese; Patrick Farris

Others in attendance: Chris Stubbs, NPS; David Piper; Sandra Piper; Elizabeth Wilkerson, Northern VA Daily; Sarah Mauck, Town of Strasburg; Suzanne Chilson, Cedar Creek Battlefield Foundation; Sarah Reid, Winchester Star

Chairperson Mary Bowser chaired the meeting.

The notes from the 21 September 2006 meeting were reviewed and approved as written.

Mr. Chris Stubbs of the National Park Service provided a general management plan status update to the Commission, the details of which were handed out to the Commissioners and the public.

There was a brief discussion led by Diann Jacox regarding the status of the expired Commission appointments.

There was a presentation and facilitated discussion from Mr. Stubbs on the draft GMP conceptual alternatives. A hard copy of the draft conceptual alternatives was provided to the Commissioners. A summary of the discussion that occurred during the presentation are appended to these commission notes.

The vote for the Commission Vice-Chairperson for the 2007 season was held. Two people were nominated: Kris Tierney and Fred Andreae. An anonymous vote was held using paper ballot, and Kris Tierney was re-elected for a second term.

There was a brief discussion of the bylaws that were presented to the Commission by the Department of the Interior. The Commissioners voted unanimously to adopt these bylaws for the Park Advisory Commission.

The Commissioners discussed the process for informing the public of the GMP alternatives. They encouraged the NPS to inform the public of the alternative concepts either through a newsletter or a public meeting. This should occur prior to issuance of the Draft GMP. The Commissioners also encouraged the NPS to present the draft alternatives to the Key Partner organizations and to local governments.

Commissioner Jim Smalls asked if he could make a brief presentation at the next Park Advisory Commission meeting on the George Washington / Jefferson National Forest planning process.

The next meeting will be on 18 January 2007 at the Middletown Town Hall.

With no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned by Chairperson Bowser.

List of handouts provided at 21 September 2006 meeting

1. Meeting agenda
2. Minutes from 21 September 2006 Commission meeting
3. GMP status update
4. Bylaws from the Dept. of the Interior
5. Draft Conceptual Alternatives paper, dated November 9, 2006

**Appendix I – Discussion of Draft Alternative Management Concepts
(9 November 2006 Version)**

- The question was raised as to whether the Park would consider an equestrian trail in addition to the planned hiking and biking trails.
- There was some discussion about there not being enough distinction among the alternatives. We should clarify the differences between the alternatives. One possibility is to combine two of the alternatives, perhaps C and D.

- There is confusion about actions common to all alternatives: if each of the boxes is checked for a particular decision point, shouldn't this be moved to the "actions common to all alternatives?"
- There is a need to highlight the cooperation with the National Historic District in all alternatives.
- There was a suggestion to globally replace "Park" with "Partnership Park".
- There is a need in the GMP to have a definitions section near the front of the document and define "Park", "Key Partners", "National Historic District", etc.
- Under "related resources", the wording should be tightened – define the term "related resources" and drop "thematically related to the park".
- Under "Collaborative Relationship", should there be a financial component? There should be a reciprocal relationship where the NPS and Key Partners bring finances to the table – a mutually supporting financial commitment. This should be a new decision point. Under this decision point, the Key Partners would become a "Friends" group like at other NPS units.
- "Technical Assistance" – this term needs to be specifically defined in the GMP. What does it mean?
- Technical assistance should be provided to communities in all alternatives, not just C and D.
- Geographic distinctions may not be the best way to define the differences among alternatives regarding technical assistance. Would we really make a distinction between the viewshed and the National Historic District? Rather, this should focus on where the park would put its priorities for technical assistance. Inside the park is top priority; outside is lower priority.
- Overall, the alternative concepts were well received by the Commissioners. We have found a way to address all the interpretive themes and focus on the key decision points. The Commissioners feel the NPS should proceed with developing these alternatives.
- The Commissioners applauded the change from the concepts that were presented on September 21, 2006, which were seen as divisive. The new alternative concepts are more functional.